

US007296197B2

(12) **United States Patent**
Pushpavanam et al.

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 7,296,197 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent:** **Nov. 13, 2007**

(54) **METADATA-FACILITATED SOFTWARE TESTING**

(75) Inventors: **Kaushik Pushpavanam**, Sammamish, WA (US); **Ujjwal Sarin**, Seattle, WA (US)

(73) Assignee: **Microsoft Corporation**, Redmond, WA (US)

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 260 days.

(21) Appl. No.: **11/051,042**

(22) Filed: **Feb. 4, 2005**

(65) **Prior Publication Data**

US 2006/0179386 A1 Aug. 10, 2006

(51) **Int. Cl.**

G11C 29/00 (2006.01)

G06F 11/00 (2006.01)

G01R 31/28 (2006.01)

G06F 9/44 (2006.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.** **714/722**; 714/38; 714/718; 714/738; 717/124

(58) **Field of Classification Search** None
See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

4,497,301	A *	2/1985	Inoue et al.	123/486
6,859,922	B1 *	2/2005	Baker et al.	717/125
6,966,053	B2 *	11/2005	Paris et al.	717/143
7,194,730	B2 *	3/2007	Pramberger	717/120
2005/0229159	A1 *	10/2005	Haba et al.	717/122
2006/0218453	A1 *	9/2006	Crump et al.	714/718

* cited by examiner


Primary Examiner—Phung My Chung

(74) *Attorney, Agent, or Firm*—Lee & Hayes, PLLC

(57) **ABSTRACT**

Described herein are one or more implementations for facilitation of computer software testing. One or more implementations, described herein, determine logical type of one or more test input-parameters based upon metadata placed on a function under test (FUT) of software. Using that determined logical type, an implementation generates data values. In some instances, those generated values are values selected from a repository of data values with associated logical types. The selection is based upon the determined logical type. After generating data values for testing the FUT, an implementation supplies the generated data values as input to the FUT.

20 Claims, 5 Drawing Sheets






Fig. 1
(background)




Fig. 2





Fig. 3



400 ↗

Fig. 4




Fig. 5

1

METADATA-FACILITATED SOFTWARE TESTING

TECHNICAL FIELD

This invention generally relates to a technology facilitating the automated testing of computer software.

BACKGROUND

Software testing is a process used to improve quality of developed computer software by detecting defects. In its simplest form, software testing tests at least one specific function of a software product under test. Herein, a “function” is an executable portion (e.g., program module, subroutine, procedure, etc.) of a software product that uses input parameters to produce an observable result. For the sake of brevity, a specific “function under test” is called FUT herein.

Typically, software testing involves devising a set of input values for a FUT that will cause the FUT to exercise all or some of its computer-executable instructions. A tester verifies that the results produced by the test of the FUT are in accord with predefined expectations. Many different conventional testing approaches exist, and they range from informal and manual ad hoc testing to formal, controlled, and automated testing.

A major tool in the tester’s toolbox is a “test harness.” FIG. 1 shows an example of a test harness **100** in a conventional software-testing scenario. FIG. 1 also shows a typical computer **110** having a primary memory **120** (e.g., volatile or non-volatile memory). This computer may be a general- or special-purpose computer in this illustrated traditional scenario. Running in this memory is the software product being tested. One function of the software product—the function being the focus of this exemplary scenario—is represented by Function Under Test (FUT) **130**. For the sake of clarity, FIG. 1 shows only one function under test (e.g., FUT **130**); however, FUT **130** may represent one or more functions being tested (concurrently or serially).

The test harness **100** operates in the memory **120** with the FUT **130** and, as illustrated in FIG. 1, “saddles” or operates with some degree of control over the FUT. Rather than receiving input as it normally would (e.g., input from a user-interface or from another function), the FUT **130** receives input from the test harness **100**. Also, rather than providing output as it normally would (e.g., output to a user-interface or to another function), the FUT **130** sends the output to the test harness **100**. Conventional test harness technology (like test harness **100**) is known to those of ordinary skill in the art of software testing.

Conventionally, the test harness **100** includes the logic for acquiring the input values for testing, logic for interacting with the FUT **130**, and logic for acquiring the results of the test. Typically, the test harness **100** also includes logic for analyzing the results to determine if the actual results match the expected results. Conventionally, the logic of a test harness is typically custom written and is inextricably intertwined with the test values, which are expected to be used to test the FUT.

As shown in FIG. 1, the illustrated combination of the test harness **100** and the FUT **130** represents a specific and exemplary scenario under which the FUT is tested. Each different specific scenario is called a “test-case.” A test-case is defined by the FUT being tested, its testing logic, and specific combinations and/or permutations of input parameters being tested.

2

An example of a conventional test-case is represented by the following definition:

TABLE 1

```

5 [PriorityOne]
  public void TestCaseNonParameterized( )
  {
    string commandToExecute =
    "base-string" + "test-string";
10    bool expectedResult = true;
    bool ignoreCase = true;
    ExecuteTest
    (commandToExecute, expectedResult,
    ignoreCase);
  }

```

15 An exemplary conventional test-case named “TestCase-NonParameterized” is shown in Table 1. The testing logic is represented by the label “ExecuteTest.”

The actual input-parameter values for each test-case are provided by one or more test vector(s). A typical test vector is a file or data structure. While a test-case defines the testing conditions, the test vector supplies the actual input-parameter values for testing the FUT under the defined testing conditions of the test-case.

25 To illustrate, consider this example that tests functions of a “numeric calculator” software program:

Test-case: Testing “addition” function with input being two integers

Test Vector: Vector 1: Add 2+3; result should be 5 Vector 2: Add -1+4; result should be 3

Test-case: Testing “multiplication” function with input being at least one negative integer

Test Vector: Vector 1: Multiply 0*-4, result should be 0 Vector 2: Multiply -2*-4, result should be 8 Vector 3: Multiply -1*-1, result should be 1

35 Effective testing of a FUT typically covers one or more test-cases and each test-case uses one or more rich test vectors. The set of values of a rich test vector typically includes a broad spectrum of plausible combinations and permutations of values for input parameters.

In the example shown in Table 1, the test-vector source (e.g., a file) is identified as being at a location specified in the test-case definition. Specifically, that location is “test-string” in this example. So, the input-parameter values for the FUT of this test-case are provided at the specified location of “test-string.”

FIG. 1 shows two exemplary test vectors: X **140** and Y **150**, respectively. The values of test vectors may be supplied via manual data-entry or automatic generation. Regardless, these test vectors X and Y are a list of values stored in a datasource (e.g., file, data structure, or database). For example, the values in test vector X **140** may include a list of positive integers for an exemplary “addition” function test case, and the values in test vector Y **150** may include a list of some positive and some negative integers for an exemplary “multiplication” function test case.

A crosshatch area **145** represents values shared between the exemplary test vectors X and Y. For example, the crosshatch area may represent a set of shared positive integers that applies to test-cases for both the exemplary “addition” and “multiplication” functions. This sharing of values between test vectors may be accomplished numerous ways. For example, sharing may be accomplished via literal copying of data between vectors or via a cross-reference of common values.

65 For a particular test-case of the FUT **130** where the test-case is associated with test vector X **140**, the test harness

100 acquires the values to be tested from test vector X. To test the FUT **130**, the test harness **100** provides these acquired values to the FUT and analyzes the FUT's results to determine if the actual results match the expected results.

In the setting of formal, controlled, and automated testing (in which a test harness is typically used), a tester typically custom writes a test-case for each different FUT, each different combination and/or permutation of input parameters, and each contemplated test vector. Conventionally, the custom-written testing logic of each test-case is tightly intertwined with the input parameters that characterize the test-case. Moreover, the contents of test vector(s) are traditionally narrowly tailored to their associated test-case(s). Consequently, test-cases are typically rigidly defined and unable to adapt to new or updated test vectors.

The scope of testing increases, not only because of issues related to rigidity and inflexibility, but, also, because the number of possible defects in the FUT and the number of configurations of the FUT increases dramatically relative to the increase in the size and complexity of the FUT. Therefore, an effective test vector for a FUT may be quite large. Not only may the test vector be large, but it is also likely to grow, change, and evolve during the testing lifecycle of the FUT.

SUMMARY

Described herein are one or more implementations for facilitation of computer software testing. One or more implementations, described herein, determine logical type of one or more test input-parameters based upon metadata placed on a function under test (FUT) of software. Using that determined logical type, an implementation generates data values. In some instances, those generated values are selected from a repository of data values with associated logical types. The selection is based upon the determined logical type. After generating data values for testing the FUT, an implementation supplies the generated data values as input to the FUT.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

The same numbers are used throughout the drawings to reference like elements and features.

FIG. 1 shows an example of a traditional software-testing scenario.

FIG. 2 an example of a software-testing scenario in accordance with at least one implementation described herein.

FIG. 3 shows operational components of an exemplary test harness in accordance with at least one implementation described herein.

FIG. 4 illustrates a flow diagram showing a methodological implementation described herein.

FIG. 5 is an example of a computing operating environment capable of (wholly or partially) implementing at least one embodiment described herein.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

The following description sets forth techniques facilitating the testing of computer software. These techniques offer flexibility within the setting of formal, controlled, and automated testing of computer software. These techniques employ a paradigm for self-describing test-cases (using metadata) and an infrastructural design for establishing and maintaining a repository of common input-parameter test

values. This repository of test values is easily shared amongst many parties who may update, add, change, remove, and modify the data values in the repository.

Test vector sets for each test-case typically evolve and grow over the testing lifecycle of a software product. In addition, new test vectors are introduced during a product's testing lifecycle. The techniques described herein provide for smooth adaptation to updated test vectors and adoption of new test vectors for existing test cases.

Exemplary Metadata-Facilitated Software Testing Environment

FIG. 2 illustrates an implementation of an exemplary test harness **200**, as described herein, for testing of software in a manner that is facilitated by the use of metadata. The harness itself is, for example, a program module executing on a computer system (such as is depicted in FIG. 5) that provides a new paradigm for formal, controlled, and automated testing of a software product that typically is executing on the same computer system. This new paradigm solves the problem of rigid test-cases by separating the test-case logic from the test-case values (i.e., test vector).

FIG. 2 illustrates, at a high-level, the test harness **200** in an exemplary software-testing scenario. The figure illustrates a typical computer **210** having a primary memory **220** (e.g., volatile or non-volatile memory). This computer may be a general- or special-purpose computer in this illustrated scenario.

Running in this memory with the test harness **200** is the software product being tested. One function of the software product in this exemplary scenario is represented by Function Under Test (FUT) **230**. For the sake of clarity, FIG. 2 shows only one function under test (e.g., FUT **230**); however, FUT **230** may represent one or more function being tested (concurrently or serially).

As shown in FIG. 2, the illustrated combination of the test harness **200** and the FUT **230** represents a specific and exemplary test-case. This test-case defines the FUT, specific combinations and/or permutations of input parameters being tested, and the testing logic tested.

Using a conventional paradigm, the contents and interfaces of each test-case are typically customized and narrowly tailored to the specifics of that test-case. For example, as shown in Table 1, the testing logic of a conventional test-case is typically custom designed for the particulars of that test-case.

In contrast, the contents and interfaces of each test-case in the new paradigm described herein are generalized and are at least one level of abstraction above the low-level details. More particularly, test-case metadata (such as test-case metadata test-case **240** in FIG. 2) specifies "logical types" for the input parameters rather than defining the input parameters specifically and/or linking to specific test vectors. A logical type is a higher-level description or name of a value stored in a native type (e.g., int, bool, float). Examples of logical types may have names like "Machine-Name," "ProcessId," "ValidPathString," "ExcludeFilter," and "Regular Expression."

FIG. 2 also shows a repository **250** of test values. The repository may be a secondary storage device (e.g., hard drive, flash memory, CD-ROM, DVD-ROM, etc.) or it may be a primary memory system (e.g., RAM) of a computer (e.g., computer **210**). In this repository, each test value has a logical type associated therewith. The type of a value may also be specified in logic instructions or in grammar.

During a software product's testing lifecycle, the set of desirable test values changes in response to the natural

evolution and growth during that lifecycle. Using the conventional approaches, the tester would probably need to re-write the customized test-cases to account for such changes. However, using the techniques described herein, the tester needs only to update (e.g., additions, deletions, and modifications) the test values in the repository **250** to account for such changes. A new test vector (using the updated values) will be dynamically generated the next time the test-case is tested.

Rather than extracting test values from a statically defined test vector (as the conventional approach does), the test harness **200** dynamically generates an instance of a test vector from the repository **250** of test values. The test harness **200** processes a test-case's self-describing metadata definition (e.g., test-case metadata **240**). In doing so, the harness determines which logical types the test-cases utilize.

For example, assume that a function called "AddTwoIntegers" is being tested. So, it is the FUT. The logical type of the FUT is "Integer:PositiveInteger:PositiveEvenInteger." The repository **250** of test values may include a listing for PositiveInteger test values that includes, for example, "1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11" and a listing for PositiveEvenInteger test values that includes, for example, "2, 4, 10."

In one implementation, the harness performs a "reflection" on the repository **250**. A "reflection" involves the harness querying the repository **250** to find test values of the determined types. The repository responds to the harness with values of that type.

In another implementation, the harness defines an "equivalence class" of data values in the repository **250**. The equivalence class definition is based upon the determined types. The repository responds with values, which are part of the defined equivalence class.

An "equivalence class" is a class of elements that are treated as equivalents. More particularly, the FUT may operate on all data values, which are members of the same equivalence class. Using the determined types specified in the test-case definition and the specified types associated with values in the repository **250**, the harness defines an equivalence class of data values in the repository. The repository supplies the values of the defined equivalence class to the harness.

An example of a test-case is represented by the following definition, which include metadata tags (e.g., using .NET™ attributes):

TABLE 2

```

[PriorityOne]
[ParameterGenerator(typeof(StringGenerator))]
public void TestCaseParametrized
(String ValidTestString)
{
    string commandToExecute = "base-string" +
ValidStringValue;
    bool expectedResult = true;
    bool ignoreCase = true;
    ExecuteTest
(commandToExecute, expectedResult, ignoreCase);
}

```

ExecuteTest is the testing logic for the TestCaseParametrized test-case of Table 2. ParameterGenerator is a metadata tag in the test-case definition that describes the TestCaseParametrized test-case. Rather than identifying an actual source of test values in the test-case definition (as a conventional test-case definition might do), this self-describing test-case specifies the "logical type."

At runtime of the test-case, the ParameterGenerator attribute is reflected (based upon a repository of input values) and the results of that reflection are used to generate values for the parameters of the TestCaseParametrized test-case. A "generator" is used to generate the actual values of a logical type of an input parameter. In Table 2, the test-case specifies that StringGenerator as generating the specific values in the input parameter's equivalence class.

10 Operation of Test Harness

FIG. 3 illustrates operational details of the test harness **200**. Because this is the same test harness **200** discussed in reference to FIG. 2, the test-harness shown in FIG. 3 retains the **200** reference designator. Similarly, the self-describing test-case definition **240**, the repository **250**, and the FUT **230** retain their original reference designators from the previous figure. Although the operational components of FIG. 3 are shown as being part of the test harness **200**, those of ordinary skill in the art understand the each operational component and sub-component may be incorporated into one or more entities other than the test harness.

As shown in FIG. 3, the test harness **200** has an equivalence-class processor **310**, an input-values storage location **320**, a results verifier **330**, and a results reporter **340**. The FUT **230** generates an output **350**, which may be persisted by the harness. An output device **360** handles the outcome reported by the results reporter **340**.

The equivalence-class processor **310** reads and analyzes the self-describing test-case definition **240**. Based upon the metadata in the self-describing test-case definition **240**, the processor **310** determines the one or more logical types of the specified input parameters. Since the harness treats all values of a specified logical type as equivalent, the processor has effectively determined the one or more equivalence classes of the input parameters of the test-case.


Once the processor **310** determines the one or more equivalence classes, the processor queries the repository **250** to find test values of that type. The repository supplies values of that type to the processor **310**. Effectively, the processor is dynamically generating or producing an instance of a test vector from the repository **250**. This dynamically generated test vector includes test values that are selected because their associated logical type matches the determined test input-parameter logical type.

Before producing the input values of a defined equivalence class based upon a logical type, the processor defines an equivalence class from which the input values are drawn. Those of ordinary skill in the art are aware of existing techniques for defining an equivalence class of members of a given, based upon equivalence relationship amongst the members of the set. To define an equivalence class, the processor **310** may use any of these existing techniques known to those of ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, one or more implementations described herein utilize a schema for defining an equivalence class based upon a given logical type. More particularly, the scheme defines a relationship amongst all known logical types in accordance with a hierarchy (i.e., a "tree") of logical types. Once a logical type is located in the hierarchy, all siblings below that type are considered part of that type's equivalence class.

For example, consider the logical type of String:Language:English in the example hierarchy of Table 3 below:

TABLE 3



As shown in Table 3, English is shown under Language and String in the hierarchy. That corresponds to the specified logical type of String:Language:English. Since US, British, and SouthAfrican are siblings of String:Language:English, they are considered to be part of the equivalence class specified by String:Language:English. The data values associated with these siblings will be included in a dynamically generated set of input values based upon a determined logical type of String:Language:English.

After determining equivalence classes and generating test values for those equivalence classes, the processor 310 supplies dynamically generated test values as input to the FUT 230. Especially when multiple values are supplied to the FUT concurrently, the processor may supply the values directly to the FUT. Alternatively, the processor may also persist the dynamically generated test values into memory, such as input value storage location 320. This way, the values may be supplied to the FUT in a serial fashion (e.g., one-at-a-time or a set-at-a-time).

Upon completion of its operations, the FUT 230 produces output 330. In the alternative and/or in addition, the FUT may produce an external effect. For example, a function designed to delete a file may not generate an output per se. Instead, the function operates on a file to remove it. The function produces an external effect.

The results verifier 330 observes the output (or effect) of the FUT and the verifier compares that to expected results. The verifier may determine the expected results. Since the determination of the expected results is probably dependent upon the actual input values, the verifier may also receive the input values from the storage location 320. In addition, the expected results will typically be supplied by the test-case definition 240.

In a conventional testing approach, the determination of the expected results each time the FUT is tested are typically narrowly proscribed by the specific and statically created test vectors. However, using the techniques described herein, the determination of the expected results each time the FUT is tested is not affected by actual values used. That is because the values of each logical type are considered part of an equivalence class. Therefore, how the expected results are determined is invariant.

The results reporter 340 reports the results of the report verifier to the output device 360. The output device may be, for example, a computer monitor, a printer, database, a communications medium, or other data storage system. Furthermore, the function of the test harness 200 may return to the processor 310 for the processor to supply additional test values as input to the FUT 230. The harness may repeat this functional loop until all the dynamically generated test

values have been tested or aborted. Since the test values have already been generated, no more values need to be generated each time the functionality returns to supplying the FUT with test values.

Methodological Implementation

FIG. 4 shows a method 400 performed by the test harness 200. This methodological implementation may be performed in software, hardware, or a combination thereof. For ease of understanding, the method is delineated as separate steps represented as independent blocks in FIG. 4; however, these separately delineated steps should not be construed as necessarily order dependent in their performance. Additionally, for discussion purposes, the method 400 is described with reference to FIG. 2.

At 402 of FIG. 4, the test harness 200 acquires a self-describing test-case definition (e.g., definition 240). The test-case definition includes metadata describing logical types for input parameters.

At 404, the harness performs equivalence-class processing. The harness determines the input-parameter logical types specified by the acquired self-describing test-case. Based upon those specified types, the harness generates input values from a repository of test values (e.g., repository 250). In generating the test values, the harness determines an “equivalence class” representative of the specified logical types and provides values associated with that equivalence class from the repository.

At 406, the harness stores the dynamically generated input values into a storage location (e.g., in memory).

Blocks 408 through 418 of FIG. 4 form a loop that the test harness repeats for each member (or set of members) in the set of dynamically generated input values. This way, the FUT will be tested with each value in the set of dynamically generated test values.

At 410, the harness supplies, as input, one or more of the values of the set of dynamically generated input values to the FUT. The FUT executes based upon that input and the FUT produces a result or has an external effect.

At 412, the harness observes the resulting output from the FUT and/or the external effect produced by the FUT.

At 414, the harness verifies whether the output (and/or the effect) meets expectations. As part of this, the harness may calculate or determine the expected results based upon the subject input that the FUT received.

At 416, the harness reports the results of the test of the FUT. Typically, the results are reported via an output device and using a user-interface. Alternatively, the results may be reported only after all members of the set of dynamically generated input values have been tested.

If members (or set of members) in the set of dynamically generated input values remain untested, then the process loops at **418** back to **408** to repeat blocks **408** through **418** again for another member (or set of members). If all members are processed, then this process ends.

Exemplary Computing System and Environment

FIG. **5** illustrates an example of a suitable computing environment **500** within which an exemplary test harness, such as test harness **200** as described herein, may be implemented (either fully or partially). The computing environment **500** may be utilized in the computer and network architectures described herein.

The exemplary computing environment **500** is only one example of a computing environment and is not intended to suggest any limitation as to the scope of use or functionality of the computer and network architectures. Neither should the computing environment **500** be interpreted as having any dependency or requirement relating to any one or combination of components illustrated in the exemplary computing environment **500**.

The exemplary test harness may be implemented with numerous other general purpose or special purpose computing system environments or configurations. Examples of well known computing systems, environments, and/or configurations that may be suitable for use include, but are not limited to, personal computers, server computers, thin clients, thick clients, hand-held or laptop devices, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based systems, set top boxes, personal digital assistants (PDA), appliances, special-purpose electronics (e.g., a DVD player), programmable consumer electronics, network PCs, minicomputers, main-frame computers, distributed computing environments that include any of the above systems or devices, and the like.

The exemplary test harness may be described in the general context of computer-executable instructions, such as program modules, being executed by a computer. Generally, program modules include routines, programs, objects, components, data structures, etc. that perform particular tasks or implement particular abstract data types. The exemplary test harness may also be practiced in distributed computing environments where tasks are performed by remote processing devices that are linked through a communications network. In a distributed computing environment, program modules may be located in both local and remote computer storage media including memory storage devices.

The computing environment **500** includes a general-purpose computing device in the form of a computer **502**. The components of computer **502** may include, but are not limited to, one or more processors or processing units **504**, a system memory **506**, and a system bus **508** that couples various system components, including the processor **504**, to the system memory **506**.

The system bus **508** represents one or more of any of several types of bus structures, including a memory bus or memory controller, a peripheral bus, an accelerated graphics port, and a processor or local bus using any of a variety of bus architectures. By way of example, such architectures can include a CardBus, Personal Computer Memory Card International Association (PCMCIA), Accelerated Graphics Port (AGP), Small Computer System Interface (SCSI), Universal Serial Bus (USB), IEEE 1394, a Video Electronics Standards Association (VESA) local bus, and a Peripheral Component Interconnects (PCI) bus, also known as a Mezzanine bus.

Computer **502** typically includes a variety of computer-readable media. Such media may be any available media that

is accessible by computer **502** and includes both volatile and non-volatile media, removable and non-removable media.

The system memory **506** includes computer-readable media in the form of volatile memory, such as random access memory (RAM) **510**, and/or non-volatile memory, such as read only memory (ROM) **512**. A basic input/output system (BIOS) **514**, containing the basic routines that help to transfer information between elements within computer **502**, such as during start-up, is stored in ROM **512**. RAM **510** typically contains data and/or program modules that are immediately accessible to and/or presently operated on by the processing unit **504**.

Computer **502** may also include other removable/non-removable, volatile/non-volatile computer storage media. By way of example, FIG. **5** illustrates a hard disk drive **516** for reading from and writing to a non-removable, non-volatile magnetic media (not shown), a magnetic disk drive **518** for reading from and writing to a removable, non-volatile magnetic disk **520** (e.g., a "floppy disk"), and an optical disk drive **522** for reading from and/or writing to a removable, non-volatile optical disk **524** such as a CD-ROM, DVD-ROM, or other optical media. The hard disk drive **516**, magnetic disk drive **518**, and optical disk drive **522** are each connected to the system bus **508** by one or more data media interfaces **525**. Alternatively, the hard disk drive **516**, magnetic disk drive **518**, and optical disk drive **522** may be connected to the system bus **508** by one or more interfaces (not shown).

The disk drives and their associated computer-readable media provide non-volatile storage of computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules, and other data for computer **502**. Although the example illustrates a hard disk **516**, a removable magnetic disk **520**, and a removable optical disk **524**, it is to be appreciated that other types of computer-readable media, which may store data that is accessible by a computer, such as magnetic cassettes or other magnetic storage devices, flash memory cards, CD-ROM, digital versatile disks (DVD) or other optical storage, random access memories (RAM), read only memories (ROM), electrically erasable programmable read-only memory (EEPROM), and the like, may also be utilized to implement the exemplary computing system and environment.

Any number of program modules may be stored on the hard disk **516**, magnetic disk **520**, optical disk **524**, ROM **512**, and/or RAM **510**, including, by way of example, an operating system **526**, one or more application programs **528**, other program modules **530**, and program data **532**.

A user may enter commands and information into computer **502** via input devices such as a keyboard **534** and a pointing device **536** (e.g., a "mouse"). Other input devices **538** (not shown specifically) may include a microphone, joystick, game pad, satellite dish, serial port, scanner, and/or the like. These and other input devices are connected to the processing unit **504** via input/output interfaces **540** that are coupled to the system bus **508**, but may be connected by other interface and bus structures, such as a parallel port, game port, or a universal serial bus (USB).

A monitor **542** or other type of display device may also be connected to the system bus **508** via an interface, such as a video adapter **544**. In addition to the monitor **542**, other output peripheral devices may include components, such as speakers (not shown) and a printer **546**, which may be connected to computer **502** via the input/output interfaces **540**.

Computer **502** may operate in a networked environment using logical connections to one or more remote computers,

such as a remote computing device **548**. By way of example, the remote computing device **548** may be a personal computer, a portable computer, a server, a router, a network computer, a peer device or other common network node, and the like. The remote computing device **548** is illustrated as a portable computer that may include many or all of the elements and features described herein, relative to computer **502**.

Logical connections between computer **502** and the remote computer **548** are depicted as a local area network (LAN) **550** and a general wide area network (WAN) **552**. Such networking environments are commonplace in offices, enterprise-wide computer networks, intranets, and the Internet. Such networking environments may be wired or wireless.

When implemented in a LAN networking environment, the computer **502** is connected to a local network **550** via a network interface or adapter **554**. When implemented in a WAN networking environment, the computer **502** typically includes a modem **556** or other means for establishing communications over the wide network **552**. The modem **556**, which may be internal or external to computer **502**, may be connected to the system bus **508** via the input/output interfaces **540** or other appropriate mechanisms. It is to be appreciated that the illustrated network connections are exemplary and that other means of establishing communication link(s) between the computers **502** and **548** may be employed.

In a networked environment, such as that illustrated with computing environment **500**, program modules depicted, relative to the computer **502** or portions thereof, may be stored in a remote memory storage device. By way of example, remote application programs **558** reside on a memory device of remote computer **548**. For purposes of illustration, application programs and other executable program components, such as the operating system, are illustrated herein as discrete blocks, although it is recognized that such programs and components reside at various times in different storage components of the computing device **502** and are executed by the data processor(s) of the computer.

Computer-Executable Instructions

An implementation of an exemplary test harness may be described in the general context of computer-executable instructions, such as program modules, executed by one or more computers or other devices. Generally, program modules include routines, programs, objects, components, data structures, etc. that perform particular tasks or implement particular abstract data types. Typically, the functionality of the program modules may be combined or distributed as desired in various embodiments.

Exemplary Operating Environment

FIG. **5** illustrates an example of a suitable operating environment **500** in which an exemplary test harness may be implemented. Specifically, the exemplary test harness(s) described herein may be implemented (wholly or in part) by any program modules **528-530** and/or operating system **526** in FIG. **5** or a portion thereof.

The operating environment is only an example of a suitable operating environment and is not intended to suggest any limitation as to the scope or use of functionality of the exemplary test harness(s) described herein. Other well known computing systems, environments, and/or configurations that are suitable for use include, but are not limited to, personal computers (PCs), server computers, hand-held or laptop devices, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based systems, programmable consumer electronics, wire-

less phones and equipment, general and special-purpose appliances, application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs), network PCs, minicomputers, mainframe computers, distributed computing environments that include any of the above systems or devices, and the like.

Computer-Readable Media

An implementation of an exemplary test harness may be stored on or transmitted across some form of computer-readable media. Computer-readable media may be any available media that may be accessed by a computer. By way of example, computer-readable media may comprise, but is not limited to, "computer storage media" and "communications media."

"Computer storage media" include volatile and non-volatile, and removable and non-removable media, implemented in any method or technology for storage of information, such as computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules, or other data. Computer storage media includes, but is not limited to, RAM, ROM, EEPROM, flash memory or other memory technology, CD-ROM, digital versatile disks (DVD) or other optical storage, magnetic cassettes, magnetic tape, magnetic disk storage or other magnetic storage devices, or any other medium which may be used to store the desired information and which may be accessed by a computer.

"Communication media" typically embodies computer-readable instructions, data structures, program modules, or other data in a modulated data signal, such as carrier wave or other transport mechanism. Communication media also includes any information delivery media.

CONCLUSION

The techniques may be implemented in many ways, including (but not limited to) program modules, general- and special-purpose computing systems, network servers and equipment, dedicated electronics and hardware, and as part of one or more computer networks. The techniques may, for example, be implemented on a computer system depicted in FIG. **5**.

Although the one or more above-described implementations have been described in language specific to structural features and/or methodological steps, it is to be understood that other implementations may be practiced without the specific features or steps described. Rather, the specific features and steps are disclosed as preferred forms of one or more implementations.

The invention claimed is:

1. A method facilitating automated testing of software, the method comprising the acts of:
 - determining logical type of one or more test input-parameters based upon metadata placed on a function under test (FUT) of software;
 - generating data values based upon the determined logical type of one or more test input-parameters;
 - supplying the generated data values as input to the FUT.
2. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the generating act comprises dynamically generating a test vector of data values for testing the FUT.
3. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the generating act comprises selecting data values from a repository of data values.
4. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the generating act comprises:

13

defining an equivalence class of logical types of test input-parameters based upon the determined logical type of one or more test input-parameters;

selecting data values from a repository of data values, wherein the selected data values are members of the defined equivalence class. 5

5. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the supplying act supplies the generated data values as input to the FUT one at a time.

6. A method as recited in claim 1 further comprising acquiring a self-describing test-case that includes the meta-data placed on the FUT. 10

7. A method as recited in claim 1 further comprising persisting the generated data values.

8. A method as recited in claim 1 further comprising observing effects of actions performed by the FUT after one or more of the generated data values has been supplied as input to the FUT. 15

9. A method as recited in claim 1 further comprising receiving output from the FUT after one or more of the generated data values has been supplied as input to the FUT. 20

10. A method as recited in claim 9 further comprising verifying whether the output from the FUT meets expected output when one or more of the generated data values has been supplied as input to the FUT. 25

11. A method as recited in claim 10 further comprising reporting results of the verifying act.

12. A method facilitating automated testing of software, the method comprising the acts of:

determining logical type of one or more test input-parameters based upon a self-describing test-case associating with a function under test (FUT) of software; 30
 defining an equivalence class of logical types of test input-parameters based upon the determined logical type of one or more test input-parameters;

14

selecting data values from a repository of data values, wherein the selected data values are members of the defined equivalence class;

supplying the selected data values as input to the FUT.

13. A method as recited in claim 12, wherein the supplying act supplies the generated data values as input to the FUT one at a time.

14. A method as recited in claim 12 further comprising acquiring a self-describing test-case that includes the meta-data placed on the FUT. 10

15. A method as recited in claim 12 further comprising persisting the selected data values.

16. A method as recited in claim 12 further comprising observing effects of actions performed by the FUT after the FUT has been supplied one or more of the selected data values as input to the FUT. 15

17. A method as recited in claim 12 further comprising receiving output from the FUT after the FUT has supplied one or more of the generated data values as input to the FUT. 20

18. A method as recited in claim 17 further comprising verifying whether the output from the FUT meets expected output when the FUT has been supplied one or more of the generated data values as input to the FUT. 25

19. A method as recited in claim 18 further comprising reporting results of the verifying act.

20. One or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions thereon that, when executed by a computer, perform a method comprising the acts of:

determining logical type of one or more test input-parameters based upon metadata placed on a function under test (FUT) of software;

generating data values based upon the determined logical type of one or more test input-parameters; 30
 supplying the generated data values as input to the FUT.

* * * * *